



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,839	12/07/2001	Francis Coret	Q67591	7789

7590

05/12/2003

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

CULLER, JILL E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/004,839

Applicant(s)

CORET ET AL.

Examiner

Jill E. Culler

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 24 February 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,840,696 to Krasuski et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,479,159 to Kamei et al.

With respect to claims 1 and 5-8, Krasuski et al. shows a label tape dispenser for a franking machine, comprising a delivery roller, 2, on which is wound a continuous tape of labels, 1, and a drive means, 10, for conveying this tape along a dispenser conveying path from the delivery roller toward a label inlet of the franking machine.

Krasuski et al. does not show a first coding means mounted on the drive means for measuring an angular displacement of the drive means or a second coding means mounted on the delivery roller for measuring an angular displacement of the delivery roller or a processing means for calculating, from a ratio of the measurements of angular displacement, a remaining length of the continuous tape of labels. Krasuski et al. also does not teach that the first and second coding means are each constituted by an optical coder comprising an optical emitter/receiver cooperating with a coder disc on which slots defining equal steps of unitary displacement of the coding means are made at regular intervals.

Kamei et al. teaches a tape device having a delivery roller, 1, and a drive means, 2, for conveying a tape, 3, with a first coding means, 5, mounted on the drive means for measuring an angular displacement of the drive means, a second coding means, 4, mounted on the delivery roller for measuring an angular displacement of the delivery roller and a processing means, 10, for calculating, from a ratio of the measurements of angular displacement, a remaining length of the continuous tape of labels. See column 2, lines 25-36. Kamei et al. also teaches that the first and second coding means are constituted by an optical coder comprising an optical emitter/receiver cooperating with a coder disc on which slots defining equal steps of unitary displacement of the coding means are made at regular intervals. See column 2, lines 16-20.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the coding means and processing means of Kamei et al. with the label tape dispenser of Krasuski et al. in order to be able to calculate a remaining length of the continuous tape of labels, as taught by Kamei et al.

With respect to claims 2-4, Krasuski et al. does not teach that the processing means comprises means for calculating and controlling a display of different thresholds corresponding respectively to 100%, 75%, 50%, 25% and 0% of the remaining length of the tape. Krasuski et al. also does not teach that the display is effected either directly at the level of the label dispenser on a display means or on a user interface of the franking machine.

Art Unit: 2854

Kamei et al. teaches that the processing means comprises means for calculating and controlling a display, 13, of the remaining length of the tape. See column 2, lines 37-38.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the display of Kamei et al. to the label tape dispenser of Krasuski et al. in order to output the results in the form of a display. With respect to claim 2, it would have been obvious to provide this display in a format with thresholds corresponding respectively to 100%, 75%, 50%, 25% and 0% in order to present the output in a format which could be easily interpreted by an operator. With respect to claims 3 and 4, it would have been obvious to locate the display in any position where it would be potentially viewable by the operator in order to make the information readily accessible.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent No. 3,564,219 to Mutziger, U.S. Patent No. 4,280,159 to Nakayama, and U.S. Patent No. 4,644,436 to Unno each teach a tape device having obvious similarities to the claimed subject matter..

Art Unit: 2854

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jill E. Culler whose telephone number is (703) 308-1413. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (703) 305-6619. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

jec
May 8, 2003



Dan Colilla
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854